



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

depend not upon subjective impressions but upon the collated written testimony of the students themselves.

4. Although verbal and stylistic peculiarities make the technique of translation more difficult in the Second Part than in the First, yet in the deeper problems of *Faust*-criticism the First Part is richer than the Second.

5. Students follow the general drift of Goethe's thought in the Second Part as well as in the First, and if it be urged that they can not possibly appreciate fully that incidental criticism and portraiture of life which the poem contains, and which are really what endears it to the modern intellectual world — if this be urged, I can only reply that the assertion is entirely true, as true, however, of the First Part as of the Second.

6. The Complete *Faust* is entirely available as a subject of academic instruction and is for learners of some ability one of the most useful and educating courses of study that can be found in the whole range of the world's literature.

CALVIN THOMAS.

University of Michigan.

RHETORIC—STYLE—METRE.

At the request of the Editors, I submit a brief rejoinder to Dr. Gummere's *Pro Domo*. The reader will have the kindness to glance at the points of my original notice, to which Dr. Gummere objects.

Where have I implied any "rejection of *Style* as a branch of Poetics?" What I wrote was: "My individual preference is for keeping them (*rhetoric* and poetry) as far asunder as possible. The less readily poetry lends itself to *rhetorical* analysis, the more truly poetical it is." Not one word in all this about *Style*! The confusion of *Rhetoric* and *Style* is Dr. Gummere's, not mine. Nowhere, in public or in private, do I fail to call attention to the importance of *Style*. But then—in my eyes—*Style* is the man, his insight into men and relations, his temperament, his atmosphere, in brief—his individuality. *Rhetoric* is something wholly different. It is a purely formal, arid, usually unproductive statement of the components of discourse. It is useful as a drill for school-boys, or even collegians, as a

corrective against vulgar errors and abuses, but it will never give one an insight into the *being* of poetry, or into the ways of poets. And this is what I take to be the sole legitimate object in studying our poetry.

Suffer me one more denial. "What will Minto's *Prose Manual* (Prof. Hart's suggestion) do for poetic style? Fancy Shakespeare taught through Defoe, Lady Macbeth through Mrs. Veal." Where is the shadow of such a suggestion? I wrote: "Prof. Minto's *Manual* will do for the rhetorical and logical side of our literature all that the most exacting teacher can demand." Again Dr. Gummere's confusion of *Rhetoric* and *Style*! In general, may I ask him to consider one far-reaching suggestion, namely, to banish from the study of poetry all consideration of "figures" and "figurative language?" What have they to do with the essence of poetry? Poetry may be most distinctively poetic, and yet wholly devoid of figure. For instance, *Hermann u. Dorothea*. Prose, conversely, may be overcharged with figure and yet not have the first spark of poetry. For instance, the essays of De Quincey and the orations of Burke. Poetry is nothing but poetic thought and poetic feeling expressed in metre. If asked what I understand by "poetic," I admit that I do not know. Who does? But assuredly the "poetic" does *not* turn upon the "figurative." What is one to think of this assertion: "The street-boy who makes a simile has 'dropped' to that extent into poetry; add metre and the fall is complete?" No boy, not even the plough-boy of Ayreshire, ever "dropped" into poetry. Although some of us admit ruefully that Robert Burns dropped out of it. Something quite different from the conjunction of simile and metre goes to the making of poetry! If Dr. Gummere wishes to test the point arithmetically, let him add up and compare the "figures" in Auld Lang Syne and in Dryden's lines On the Death of Lord Hastings. Perhaps the comparison will lead him to modify his statement that "metaphors are the foundation of poetic language."

Readers, Dr. Gummere among them, will better understand my review of his book if I place them at the precise point from which I wrote it. The English Literature Course in the University of Cincinnati is to be changed.

Instead of requiring three years, three hours each, we are to require only two years of two hours each. Advanced students may then elect a special course in English criticism, an attempt at a *Seminar*. Leaving this out of the discussion and confining myself to the required study, I may state that one year is to be assigned exclusively to English Prose. Minto's Manual will be the text-book. In connection with it the class will read two or three long prose pieces and learn to do for them what Prof. Minto has done for his three leading authors. Whoever passes through this year ought certainly to be familiar with every figure, turn, and device of expression. Then comes the second year, exclusively devoted to English Poetry. The two text-books will be Hales's *Longer English Poems* and Dr. Gummere's *Handbook*. At least one of Shakespeare's dramas will be studied carefully. Now to what extent is the *Handbook* going to help my pupils? Are they to review briefly and hurriedly, what Prof. Minto has already taught them so exhaustively, namely, the formal side of speech, whether prose or poetry? What we need is a treatment of metre. To that extent the *Handbook* will be useful. Everything else—I say it frankly—will only be in the way. No professor of English literature, in dealing with such a class, can stop to debate the question whether in the *Urgeschichte* of poetry metaphor grew out of simile or vice versa. No amount of erudition in *Béowulf* and alliterative verse will help the class to read Spenser or Milton. As to the allusions in the *Handbook* to mediæval literature, they are—once more—too meagre to do good. My own theory with regard to a text-book has always been that what it states, it should state with sufficient fulness to be self-explanatory. Can we rightfully demand of our teachers of English literature that they shall be up in Prudentius? I doubt whether even the teachers of Latin would stand the test.

At all events, as a practical teacher, I ask for a practical book, one that will enable my pupils to read English verse correctly. The *Handbook*, so far as it treats of metre, will do this. But I can not help saying that Dr. Gummere would have made a better book, had he restricted his pages to metre. If he wishes to compose a treatise on Rhetoric from

the point of comparative literature, by all means let him do so. There is room for one.

I can not undertake to discuss in this place Dr. Gummere's proposed "try" at the basis for English prosody. The "try" must first be brought out a little more fully. I can only shake my head—provisionally—at one or two points. "Movement" of verse is something far more subtle than "the sum of relations of its parts." Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, and Tennyson have different movements in their blank verse, yet these movements can not be denoted, or even suggested, by any system of notation yet devised. The pulse of the verse matches the pulse of the heart. We shall not measure the former until we measure the latter. As to the proposition that End-Rime is mainly concerned with the stanza, not [with] the verse, I decline to subscribe to it. The presence of rime gives a different quality to the verse, which is not to be accounted for by any line-grouping. We may have rime without stanza, stanza without rime.

In conclusion let me urge Dr. Gummere to re-examine my remarks upon the subtle relation between metre and mood, instead of labelling them *fragile et caducum*. Is the spiritual in verse more fragile than the material? Without reverting to the *ottava rima* (Keats made his *Isabella* serious *despite* the metre), let us consider the *In Memoriam* metre. Could anything be simpler? Iambic octosyllabic quatrain, riming *a b b a*. Any pupil can learn that much in ten minutes. Are we to stop there? For one, I shall not scruple to tell my class that had Tennyson made the slightest possible change, merely shifted the rimes to *a b a b*, he would not only have written in a different strain, he would have written a different poem.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

A MUCH NEEDED REFORM.

I wish to speak of a matter which must frequently have occurred to every teacher of any experience, but against which, as far as I know, no one has yet ventured to protest—I mean the illogical, misleading, not to say senseless proceeding, so common in our grammars and elementary books for teaching foreign